



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,142	09/22/2003	Sergey Blyashov	ENVI-001/01US 301144-2002	2832
23419 7590 11/12/2009 COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP ATTN: Patent Group Suite 1100 777 - 6th Street, NW Washington, DC 20001				
EXAMINER				
STORK, KYLE R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/12/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,142

Applicant(s)

BLYASHOV, SERGEY

Examiner

KYLE R. STORK

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the remarks filed 8 September 2009.
2. Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 19, 24, 29, and 33 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-8, 11, 13, 15, 19-26, 28-35, and 37-40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner (U.S. Pub. No. 20030233296; publication date December 18, 2003; filed December 1, 2000), and further in view of Fortner et al. (US 6529898, filed 22 July 1999, hereafter Fortner).

Regarding independent claim 1, Wagner discloses a method of designing a report file used for automatic report generation, the method comprising:

- defining, in response to a user input specifying a structure of the report file, a first report group a first report group comprised of one or more page definitions, the first report group being of a first group type selected from among a plurality of predefined group types (Figure 10; p.3, para. 43, 45, 46; p.6, para. 72, 73 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches configuring the report in a

specific format determined by the group and the page definitions with the group being a type of tax return and the definitions being the information to include);

- associating a first data source with the first report group (p.2, para. 34; p.3, para. 41, 45; p.6, para. 70 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches the IRS database being associated with the federal tax return);
- identifying one or more fields for inclusion within each of the one or more page definitions (p.3, para. 43, 46; p.6, para. 71, 72 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches identifying information to be included in the report); and
- specifying an association between content from the first data source and each of the one or more fields (p.3, para. 43, 46; p.6, para. 71, 72 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches an association between retrieved content and the fields since the content is filtered to be included in a report).

Wagner fails to specifically disclose presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query. However, Fortner discloses presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query (column 5, lines 13-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Fortner with Wagner, thereby allowing a user to select parameters for report generations.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Wagner discloses the method of claim 1 further including:

- associating one or more properties with each of the one or more fields (p.3, para. 43, 46; p.6, para. 71, 72 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches associating user preferences with the fields).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Wagner discloses the method of claim 1 wherein:

- the first report group is specified to also include a second report group (p.4, para. 53; p.6, para. 76 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches multiple forms in a form repository and generating different forms based on the same information).

Regarding independent claim 7, Wagner discloses a report generation method comprising:

- creating a report file defining a report structure based upon at least one report group comprised of or more page definitions, the report file containing information identifying one or more data sources associated with the at least one report group and field descriptive information relating to a plurality of fields included within the one or more page definitions (Fig. 1a, 1b; p.2, para. 34; p.3, para. 41, 43, 45, 46; p.6, para. 70-73 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, Wagner teaches creating the report in a specific format determined by the group and the page definitions with the group being a type of tax return and the

definitions being the information to include, the IRS database is associated with the federal tax return and information to be included in the report is identified based on user preferences);

- retrieving data source information from the one or more data sources consistent with an association, established in response to field content information received through a user interface, between content from the data source and the plurality of fields (Figure 10; Fig. 1a, 1b; p.2, para. 34 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, Wagner teaches retrieving information from multiple sources); and
- rendering an output report document based upon the report file and the data source information, the output report document including one or more output report pages formatted consistently with each of the one or more page definitions (p.2, para. 36; p.3, para. 43-46; p.6, para. 72, 73 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches creating a document based on the structure, user preferences and content retrieved from the sources).

Wagner fails to specifically disclose presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query. However, Fortner discloses presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query (column 5, lines

13-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fortner with Wagner, thereby allowing a user to select parameters for report generations.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Wagner discloses the method of claim 7 further including:

- prompting a user to enter parameter values associated with the plurality of fields and receiving the parameter values entered by the user (p.3, para. 44, 45; p.4, para. 50; p.7, para. 82 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches prompting a user and user preferences used with the fields).

Regarding dependent claim 11, the claim reflects the method for performing the operations of claims 1 and 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Wagner discloses the method of claim 7 wherein:

- the field descriptive information includes formatting information (p.3, para. 46; p.5, para. 59; p.6, para. 70, 73 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches formatting information included for generating a report in a specific format).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Wagner discloses the method of claim 7 wherein:

- the rendering includes concatenating first and second values corresponding to first and second items of the data source information (p.3, para. 44, 46 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches creating a report using the retrieved data and configuring the data into a specific format).

Regarding independent claim 19, Wagner discloses a report generation system comprising:

- a client unit configured to execute plural client components including a report explorer application and a report designer application, the report designer application containing a report rendering module (Fig. 2b; p.2, para. 31; p.3, para. 44-46; p.6, para. 65, 73 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, Wagner teaches a client connected to a network which could be the Internet and multiple users being allowed to create reports and a report repository and a report generator including formatting);
- a server unit configured to execute plural server components including a business logic module and a report writer module wherein the report writer module is configured to cooperate with the client unit in producing the report file (p.2, para. 31; p.3, para. 44, 46, 47; p.6, para. 73; p.7, para. 84 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches a server, commercial software and a report writer since a report is generated and displayed based on the structure and included fields); and
- a database server in communication with the server unit, the database server providing content information to the server unit in connection with production by the report rendering module of an output report document based upon the report file (p.2, para. 30, 34; p.3, para. 41, 44; p.6, para. 71, 73 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches a database storing information used in creating reports).

Wagner fails to specifically disclose presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query. However, Fortner discloses presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query (column 5, lines 13-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fortner with Wagner, thereby allowing a user to select parameters for report generations.

Regarding dependent claims 20 and 22, the claims reflect the system for performing the operations of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 21, the claim reflects the system for performing the operations of claim 1 and Figure 1a and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 23, the claim reflects the system for performing the operations of claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 24, Wagner discloses a computer-readable medium encoded with a report file used by a computer in connection with generation of an output report document, the report file comprising:

- a database query identifying a data source (Fig. 1a, 1b; p.2, para. 30, 34; p.6, para. 70 – as demonstrated in the figures and cited text, Wagner teaches querying a database to retrieve information);
- data filter information defining filter operations to be performed upon source data retrieved from the data source (p.3, para. 43, 46; p.6, para. 72 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches a filter module for filtering retrieved information);
- descriptive information specifying the location and appearance of the source data within pages of the output report document (p.3, para. 43, 45, 46; p.6, para. 72, 73 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches configuring the report in a specific format determined by the group and the page definitions including locations and appearance); and
- textual data to be displayed upon the pages of the output report document (p.5, para. 57 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches creating and displaying a report with text data).

Wagner fails to specifically disclose presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query. However, Fortner discloses presenting a graphical representation of a plurality of data sources and representations of a plurality of fields, receiving, via a user interface, input for selecting, a first data source for association with the first report group wherein each

of the available data sources comprises a predefined database query (column 5, lines 13-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fortner with Wagner, thereby allowing a user to select parameters for report generations.

Regarding dependent claim 25, the claim reflects the report file for performing the operations of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 26, the claim reflects the report file for performing the operations of claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Wagner discloses the report file of claim 25 further including:

- user defined script information (p.3, para. 43, 44 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches user preferences).

Regarding independent claim 29, the claim reflects the report file for performing the operations of claims 1, 8 and 24 and is rejected along the same rationale since Wagner teaches multiple data sources in Figures 1a and 1b.

Regarding dependent claim 30, the claim reflects the report file for performing the operations of claim 24 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 31, the claim reflects the report file for performing the operations of claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Wagner discloses the report file of claim 29 wherein:

- the first report group is further comprised of a third report group (p.4, para. 53; p.6, para. 76 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Wagner teaches multiple forms in a form repository and generating different forms based on the same information).

As per independent claim 33, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 33 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 34 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 35, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 2. Claim 35 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 4. Claim 37 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 38, Wagner and Fortner disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Fortner further discloses representation of a plurality of available data sources are presented in a list via a user interface (column 5, lines 13-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fortner with Wagner, thereby allowing a user to select parameters for report generations.

As per dependent claims 39 and 40, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 38. Claims 39 and 40 are similarly rejected.

5. Claims 3, 27, and 36 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner and Fortner in view of Barritz et al. (U.S. Patent 6938027; date of patent August 30, 2005; filed August 31, 2000; provisional application filed September 2, 1999).

Regarding dependent claims 3 and 27, Wagner teaches the plurality of group types consisting of forms (p.3, para. 45) but does not disclose the plurality of group types consisting of grid and pivot table. Barritz teaches creating a report in a grid or table type (col. 9, lines 31-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Barritz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify group types taught by Wagner to include a grid and table as taught by Barritz, because Wagner teaches creating a financial form using a group type (p.3, para. 44, 46; p.6, para. 73) and Barritz teaches an apparatus and method for creating a financial form using a table or grid which would improve a process that involves multiple software products and computers that is laborious, repetitive, error-prone, expensive and impractical (col.3, lines 50-63; col. 9, lines 31-37).

As per dependent claim 36, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 3. Claim 36 is similarly rejected.

6. Claims 5 and 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner and Fortner in view of Van Renesse (U.S. Patent 6529953; date of patent March 4, 2003; filed December 17, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Wagner teaches multiple sources (Figures 1a, 1b) but does not disclose the first group type is a pivot table type comprised of a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns, the associating including associating the first data source with the plurality of rows and a second data source with the plurality of columns. Van Renesse teaches a table with rows associated with a data source and columns associated with another source (col. 3, lines 53-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Van Renesse before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by Wagner to include a table with rows and columns associated with sources as taught by Van Renesse, because Wagner teaches creating a form using data from multiple sources (Figures 1a, 1b; p.3, para. 44, 46; p.6, para. 73) and Van Renesse teaches creating a table with information from multiple sources (col. 3, lines 53-57).

Regarding dependent claim 12, the claim reflects the method for performing the operations of claims 1 and 5 and is rejected along the same rationale.

7. Claim 6 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner and Fortner in view of Davis (U.S. Patent 6920608; date of patent July 19, 2005; filed May 18, 2000).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Wagner teaches selecting content to be included (p.3, para. 43, 46; p.6, para. 72) but does not disclose selecting content items from a fields tree displayed to a user. Davis teaches selecting items from a fields tree (col. 22, lines 18-20; col. 37, lines 18-21, 37-41; col. 45, lines 35-38). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Davis before him at the time the invention was made, to modify selecting content as taught by Wagner to include selecting content from a field tree as taught by Davis, because Wagner teaches creating a financial form using selected content (p.3, para. 44, 46; p.6, para. 73) and Davis teaches creating a financial report using content selected from a fields tree (col. 9, lines 56-58).

8. Claims 9 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner and Fortner in view of Sweet et al. (U.S. Patent 6789080; date of patent September 7, 2004; filed March 13, 2002; continuation of application filed February 6, 2002).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Wagner teaches outputting a report document (p.3, para. 44; p.6, para. 73) but does not disclose the report document comprises a PDF document. Sweet teaches a report document created as a PDF document (col. 9, lines 44-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Sweet before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a report document taught by Wagner to include a PDF document as taught by Davis, because Wagner teaches outputting a report document (p.3, para. 44; p.6, para. 73) and Sweet teaches a PDF report (col. 9, lines 44-50) so creating the report in a PDF format would allow users operating on different systems to correctly view the report.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Wagner does not disclose automatically generating additional pages of the output report document as necessary to incorporate

the entirety of the data source information into the output report document. Sweet teaches additional pages for incorporating the entirety of the information (col. 2, lines 28-40; col. 14, lines 34-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Sweet before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a report document taught by Wagner to include additional pages for the entirety of the information as taught by Davis, because Wagner teaches outputting a report document (p.3, para. 44; p.6, para. 73) and Sweet teaches a PDF report with additional pages (col. 2, lines 28-40; col. 9, lines 44-50; col. 14, lines 34-46) so creating the report in a PDF format would allow users operating on different systems to correctly view the report.

9. Claim 14 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner and Fortner in view of Morita et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030076995; publication date April 24, 2003; filed December 9, 2002; continuation of application filed August 31, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Wagner does not disclose the field descriptive information further includes field coordinate information. Morita teaches field coordination information (p.9, para. 84). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Morita before him at the time the invention was made, to modify field descriptive information as taught by Wagner to include field coordinate information as taught by Morita, because Wagner teaches creating a financial form using field descriptive information (p.3, para. 44, 46; p.6, para.

73) and Morita teaches creating a financial form using field coordinate information (p.2, para. 35; p.9, para. 84).

10. Claims 16-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner and Fortner in view of Burt (U.S. Patent 6990480; date of patent January 24, 2006; filed January 31, 2003; continuation of application filed September 18, 2000).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Wagner does not disclose a query field, the data source information including a value associated with the query field. Burt teaches a query field and data associated with the field (col. 15, lines 66-67; col. 27, lines 20-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Burt before him at the time the invention was made, to modify fields taught by Wagner to include a query field as taught by Burt, because Wagner teaches creating a financial form using fields (p.3, para. 44, 46; p.6, para. 73) and Burt teaches creating a financial form using a query field (col. 15, lines 66-67; col. 27, lines 20-22; col. 43, lines 63-65).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Wagner does not disclose an aggregation field having a value based upon the value of the first of the plurality of fields and a third of the plurality of fields. Burt teaches an aggregation field with a value based on other fields (col. 30, lines 31-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Burt before him at the time the invention was made, to modify fields taught by Wagner to include an aggregation field as taught by Burt, because Wagner teaches creating a financial form using fields (p.3, para. 44, 46;

p.6, para. 73) and Burt teaches creating a financial form using an aggregation field (col. 30, lines 31-35; col. 43, lines 63-65).

Regarding dependent claim 18, Wagner does not disclose a calculated field having a value produced by execution of a script. Burt teaches a calculated field and a script for performing the calculations (col. 27, lines 20-22; col. 51, lines 50-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wagner and Burt before him at the time the invention was made, to modify fields taught by Wagner to include a calculated field as taught by Burt, because Wagner teaches creating a financial form using fields (p.3, para. 44, 46; p.6, para. 73) and Burt teaches creating a financial form using a calculated field (col. 27, lines 20-22; col. 43, lines 63-65; col. 51, lines 50-62).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 8 September 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's initial argument is based upon the belief that Wagner fails to disclose, "defining, in response to a user input specifying a structure of the report file, a first report group (pages 10-11)." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Wagner discloses a user selection of a report group or type to be generated (Figure 10, item 1002). Based upon this request, the appropriate structured report is defined and generated (paragraphs 0081-0084). For this reason, this argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that Wagner teaches away from such a limitation, as a "user does not need to identify the particular information need, but must merely identify the form to be generated (page 11; Wagner: paragraph 0072). The examiner respectfully disagrees. The user provides an input to the system of Wagner. This input specifies a form to be generated (paragraph 0072). By specifying a form to be generated, the user has thus specified the structure of the report file, as each form has its own specific structure. The applicant appears to be interpreting the claim language as requiring a user to input data to be used to populate a report file, and generation of a report file based upon said input data, the claim language merely requires a user input specifying the structure of the report file. For this reason, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that Fortner fails to disclose use of a predefined database query (pages 13-14). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fortner discloses a graphical interface for interacting with a database. The user is able to select predefined queries from a drop-down menu (column 5, lines 13-46). For this reason, this argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that the examiner has failed to provide reasoning for why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have combined Fortner with Wagner (pages 14-15). The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Fortner provides a method of receiving a predefined user input via a GUI. Wagner provides a user the ability to select and generate reports based upon a user input. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Fortner with Wagner, since it would have allowed a user to enter predefined queries via a GUI, in order to allow a user to narrow, and specify, parameters for selection of reports. For this reason, this argument is not persuasive.

With respect to claim 7, the applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose that the data source information is consistent with an association, established in response to field content information received through a user interface, between content from the data source and the plurality of fields (page 15). Again, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The user provides an input to the system of Wagner. This input specifies a form to be generated (paragraph 0072). By specifying a form to be generated, the user has thus specified the structure of the field content information (report form). This form is then associated with the data to populate the form. For this reason, the argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that Wagner fails to disclose a filter module defined by user selection of one or more elements (pages 15-17). Again, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The filter expressions of Wagner are automatically selected based upon the user's selection of the form he/she wished to populate (paragraph

0072). Therefore, based upon the user's selection of a form, the user has inherently selected the one or more filter elements to be applied to the data. For this reason, this argument is not persuasive.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **KYLE R. STORK** whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30)**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Stephen Hong** can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178

/Kyle R Stork/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178